SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

1. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS			
PATRICIA DOUGLAS				NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC			
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff			County of Residence of	First Listed Defendant		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	me, Address, Telephone Nu	mber and Email Add	iress)	NOTE: IN LAND	CONDEMNATION CASES, US	SE THE LOCATION OF THE	
Craig Thor Kimmel, Esquire				LAND I	NVOLVED.		
Kimmel & Silverman, 30 E. Butler Pike	P.C.			Attorneys (If Known)			
Ambler, PA 19002			_				
(215) 540-8888 II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. CI		RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
D 1 U.S. Government	3 3 Federal Question	, 0,10 201 011137		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT		and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF	
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government)	or a Party)	Cítiza	en of This State 🗇		rincipal Place 🔲 4 🗇 4	
(3.2 U.S. Government	① 4 Diversity		Citiza	en of Another State			
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship	of Parties in Item III)			of Business In		
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation		
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box On		Television of the	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR	Y [7 61	0 Agriculture	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State Reapportionment	
120 Marine 130 Miller Act	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product	 362 Personal Injury - Med, Malpractic 		O Other Food & Drug Drug Related Scizure	423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	10 Antitrust 10 436 Banks and Banking	
7 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	365 Personal Injury •	-	of Property 21 USC 881	PROPERTY RIGHTS	450 Commerce 460 Deportation	
(2) 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	Slander	Product Liability 368 Asbestos Persona	al (D 64	B R.R. & Truck	☐ 820 Copyrights	470 Racketeer Influenced and	
☐ 151 Medicate Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability	Injury Product Liability		60 Airline Regs. 60 Occupational	(7) 830 Palent (7) 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit	
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine	PERSONAL PROPER	TY	Safety/Health	2 - 7- 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	☐ 490 Catile/Sat TV	
(Excl. Veterans) (2) 153 Recovery of Overpayment		 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 		O Other LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	☐ 810 Selective Service ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/	
of Veteran's Benefits	350 Motor Vehicle	380 Other Personal	C 71	O Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 IIIA (1395ff)	Exchange	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Limbility	Property Damage 385 Property Damage	. 072	Act O Labor/Mgmt. Relations	☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	□ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410	
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	360 Other Personal Injury	Product Liability		O Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO		O Railway Labor Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	O 441 Voting O 442 Employment	510 Motions to Vacat Sentence		O Other Labor Litigation 11 Empl. Ret. Inc.	O 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act	
🗇 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	1 443 Housing/	Hobeas Corpus:		Security Act	D 871 IRS-Third Party	☐ 895 Freedom of Information	
(7) 240 Torts to Land (7) 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations 444 Welfare	3 530 General 5 535 Death Penalty	-	IMMIGRATION	26 USC 7609	Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination	
3 290 All Other Real Property		☐ 540 Mandamus & Oil ☐ 550 Civil Rights		2 Naturalization Application 3 Habeas Corpus -		Under Equal Access to Justice	
		3 555 Prison Condition		Alien Detainee		950 Constitutionality of	
	Other 440 Other Civil Rights		I 46	S Other Immigration Actions		State Statutes	
				•			
SR 1 Original ☐ 2 R		Remanded from E			erred from		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	^N			Do not cite jurisdictions	l statutes unless diversity):	, see a see	
YA. CAUSINGE ACT	Brief description of call Fair Debt Collect	use: xtion Practices A	ct		•		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P.		N D	EMANDS	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	rif demanded in complaint: : ☑ Yes □ No	
VIII. RELATED CAS		JUDGE		/	DOCKET NUMBER		
Explanation:		••••					
2.70			1	\nearrow			
	5-11	CICNATURE (EATTO	RNEY OF RECORD			
DATE		SIGHALUKE Ø	* WIIO	MINING OF MECOND			

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be assignment to appropriate calendar.	used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of
Address of Plaintiff: 14 New Tersay Avenue Respose	leer, NY 12144
Address of Defendant: 507 Prudentral Road Horsh	am PA 19044
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:	
(Use Reverse Side For Ada	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and	
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes□ No□
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes- No.
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	The Table 1
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year	previously terminated action in this court?
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit action in this court?	
***************************************	Yes No
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier nur	
terminated action in this court?	Ycs□ No□
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights of	ease filed by the same individual?
	Yes No No
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: D Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
 □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts □ FELA 	
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	2. D Airplane Personal Injury 3. D Assault, Defamation
4. Antitrust	4. D Marine Personal Injury
5. D Patent	5. D Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. D Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Please
V. — Educa Managament Remnons	specify)
7. Civil Rights	7. □ Products Liability
8. 🗆 Habeas Corpus	8. D Products Liability — Asbestos
9. D Securities Act(s) Cases	9. D All other Diversity Cases
10 D Social-Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
11. D All other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S.C 3 1692 (Please specify)	
ARBITRATION CERTIF	FICATION
1. (Check Appropriate Cate, counsel of record do hereby certify:	gory)
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 3.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and be	lief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
\$150,000,000 exclusive of interest and costs; □ Relief other than monetary damages is fought.	
Rener other man monetary dimages is lought.	E 31.00
DATE: 5-0-11 /MIN / MINO	
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	Attorney I.D.# has been compliance with F.R.C.P, 38.
,	
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or will except as noted above.	thin one year previously terminated action in this court
7 2011 / 1/2 1/2 1/2	57111A
DATE: 3-281 (My / My / Miloracy-al-Law)	

CIV, 609 (6/08)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Patricia Doll	:	CIVIL ACTION	
v. NCO Financial S	ysems, Inc	NO.	
In accordance with the Cive plaintiff shall complete a Cafiling the complaint and servoide of this form.) In the designation, that defendant the plaintiff and all other pa	il Justice Expense and Delay lase Management Track Design of a copy on all defendants. (Se event that a defendant does no shall, with its first appearance,	Reduction Plan of this court, counsation Form in all civil cases at the test of 1:03 of the plan set forth on the rot agree with the plaintiff regarding submit to the clerk of court and seck Designation Form specifying the ed.	ime of everse g said rve on
SELECT ONE OF THE F	OLLOWING CASE MANAG	GEMENT TRACKS:	
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases	brought under 28 U.S.C. § 224	41 through § 2255.	()
(b) Social Security – Cases and Human Services de	requesting review of a decision nying plaintiff Social Security	n of the Secretary of Health Benefits.	()
(c) Arbitration – Cases requ	aired to be designated for arbit	ration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvexposure to asbestos.	ving claims for personal injury	or property damage from	()
commonly referred to as	Cases that do not fall into track s complex and that need specia side of this form for a detailed	of intense management by	()
(f) Standard Management -	- Cases that do not fall into any	y one of the other tracks.	(X)
3-28-11 Date 215-540-888	Attorney-at-law 877-788-2864	Attorney for Limme 10 Cred Haw	<u>com</u>
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 PATRICIA DOUGLAS, 4 Plaintiff 5 ٧. Case No.: 6 7 NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL 8 Defendant (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 9 10 **COMPLAINT** 11 PATRICIA DOUGLAS ("Plaintiff"), by her attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., 12 alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"): 13 INTRODUCTION 14 1. Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"). 16 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 17 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states 18 that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court 19 without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original 20 21 jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States. 22 3. Defendant conducts business and has an office in the Commonwealth of 23 Pennsylvania and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established. 24 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1). 25 5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

14

13

15

16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23

24

25

PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Rensselaer, New York 12144.
- 7. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 8. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road in Horsham, Pennsylvania, 19044.
- 9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and attempt to collect a consumer debt from Plaintiff.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 11. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute. which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties. See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse. and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair of unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.
- 12. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any

person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.

- 13. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 14. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 15. At all relevant times, Defendant was attempting to collect an alleged consumer debt from Plaintiff.
 - 16. The alleged debt at issue arose out of transactions, which were primarily for

17. Beginning in or around January 2009 and continuing through May 2010,

Defendant, its agents, employees, and servants, contacted Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment for an alleged debt owed to Citibank.

personal, family, or household purposes.

- 18. In its attempts to collect a debt, Defendant made repeated and continuous calls to Plaintiff's home and work telephone numbers.
- 19. Defendant made calls to Plaintiff's home telephone, and at times left voice mail messages, almost every day for more than one (1) year.
 - 20. At all times, Plaintiff has disputed owing the alleged debt.
- 21. Upon information and belief, Defendant is attempting to collect a debt which Plaintiff paid in full in 2005.
- 22. Each time Plaintiff spoke with Defendant, she informed Defendant that the debt had been paid in full and sought validation of alleged debt.
- 23. Defendant, however, refused to provide Plaintiff with any additional information regarding the alleged debt.
- 24. Instead Defendant would get angry with Plaintiff insisting, "no you just owe this [debt]" and "you have to pay this [debt]".
- 25. Several times while Plaintiff was trying to request additional information from Defendant, Defendant hung up on her.
- 26. Defendant threatened Plaintiff that it would report the disputed debt to the credit reporting bureaus.
- 27. On May 21, 2010, Defendant telephoned Plaintiff's sister looking for Plaintiff, despite having Plaintiff's current contact information.

- 28. This caused Plaintiff to suffer extreme embarrassment.
- 29. Upon information and belief, Defendant sought to collect a debt from Plaintiff despite the fact that it had no knowledge of its validity.
- 30. Defendant's actions in attempting to collect the alleged debt were harassing, abusive and highly deceptive.

CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

- 31. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.</u>, 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); <u>see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp.</u>, 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); <u>Clomon v. Jackson</u>, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 32. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).
- 33. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 34. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
 - a. Defendant violated of the FDCPA generally;
 - b. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiff in connection with the collection of an alleged debt;
 - c. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA, when it caused the Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiff;
 - d. Defendant violated §1692e of the FDCPA by using false, deceptive, or misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of a debt:
 - e. Defendant violated §1692e(2) of the FDCPA by falsely representing the character, amount or legal status of any debt;
 - f. Defendant violated §1692e(8) of the FDCPA by communicating or

threatening to communicate to any person credit information which is known or which should be known to be false, including failure to communicate that a disputed debt is disputed;

- g. Defendant violated §1692e(10) of the FDCPA by using false representations or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect a debt;
- h. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiff to collect or attempt to collect a debt; and
- Defendant acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, PATRICIA DOUGLAS, respectfully pray for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual compensatory damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

2

this case.

DATED: 3-28-11

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, PATRICIA DOUGLAS, demands a jury trial in

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & \$ILVERMAN, P.C.

By:

Craig Thor Kimmel Attorney ID # 57100

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com